

To: **Technology Center**  
Facsimile Number: (703) 872-9306

Total Pages Sent: 3

From: **Robert N. Rountree**  
**Robert N. Rountree, LLC**  
Facsimile: 719-783-0990  
Phone: 719-783-0990

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 26 2005


## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of: **Schmidl**Docket Number: **TI-30673**Serial No.: **09/635,146**Art Unit: **2666**Filed: **08/08/2000**Examiner: **M.J. Moore, Jr.**

For: **WIRELESS PACKET COMMUNICATIONS WITH EXTENDED ADDRESSING  
CAPABILITY**

## CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the following papers are being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S.  
Patent and Trademark Office at (703) 872-9306 on the date shown below:

  
Robert N. Rountree, Reg. No. 39,347

July 26, 2005  
Date

## FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>FACSIMILE COVER SHEET</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> AMENDMENT _____ (# Pages)	
<input type="checkbox"/> NEW APPLICATION		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Request Form (2 Pages)	
<input type="checkbox"/> DECLARATION (# Pages)		<input type="checkbox"/> NOTICE OF APPEAL (# Pages)	
<input type="checkbox"/> ASSIGNMENT (# Pages)		<input type="checkbox"/> APPEAL _____ (# Pages)	
<input type="checkbox"/> DRAWING AMENDMENT (# Page)		<input type="checkbox"/> FEE TRANSMITTAL (# Page)	
<input type="checkbox"/> INFORMAL DRAWINGS		<input type="checkbox"/> REPLY BRIEF (IN TRIPLICATE) (# Pages)	
<input type="checkbox"/> CONTINUATION APP'N (# Pages)			
<input type="checkbox"/> DIVISIONAL APP'N			
NAME OF INVENTOR(S): <b>Schmidl</b>		RECEIPT DATE & SERIAL NO.: <b>09/ 635,146</b>	
TITLE OF INVENTION: <b>WIRELESS PACKET COMMUNICATIONS WITH EXTENDED ADDRESSING CAPABILITY</b>		FILING DATE: <b>August 8, 2000</b>	
TI FILE NO.: <b>TI-30673</b> DEPOSIT ACCT. NO.: <b>20-0668</b>			
DATE FAXED: <b>July 26, 2005</b>			
DUE:			
ATTY/SEC'Y: <b>Robert N. Rountree</b>			

This facsimile is intended only for the use of the address named and contains legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this telecopy, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. Applicable privileges are not waived by virtue of the document having been transmitted by facsimile. Any misdirected facsimiles should be returned to the sender by mail at the address indicated on this cover sheet.

Robert N. Rountree, LLC  
70360 Highway 69  
Cotopaxi, CO 81223

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER


JUL 26 2005

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of: **Schmidt**Serial No.: **09/635,146**Filed: **August 8, 2000**Attorney Docket No.: **TI-30673**Examiner: **M.J. Moore, Jr.**Art Unit: **2666**For: **WIRELESS PACKET COMMUNICATIONS WITH EXTENDED ADDRESSING  
CAPABILITY**

## APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST FORM

July 26, 2005

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450I hereby certify that the above correspondence is being facsimile  
transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on July 26, 2005.  
Robert N. Rountree, Reg. No. 39,347

Dear Sir:

The following Interview Request is submitted in the format of PTOL-413A. An interview is hereby requested with Examiner Michael Moore and SPE Frank Duong concerning the above-referenced application. The application is under final rejection. A Notice of Appeal was filed July 21, 2005.

Tentative Participants: Examiner Michael Moore, Jr.; SPE Frank Duong; Robert N. Rountree, Reg. No. 39,347, Attorney for Applicant.

Proposed Date: After August 8, 2005 when SPE Duong returns from vacation.

Proposed Time: AM


Type of Interview Requested: Telephonic

Exhibit To Be Shown: None

Issues:

	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
1) Whether claim 1 in combination with objected to claim 6 is patentable over Perlman et al. (USP 5,450,407).	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
2) Whether original claim 16 in combination with original claim 19 is new matter.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
3) Whether independent claim 23 in combination with depending claims 24-25 raises any new issues.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
4) Whether independent claim 23 in combination with depending claims 24-25 would be different from claim 25 rewritten in independent form with the limitations of claims 23-24.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: Applicant believes the arguments are self-explanatory as well-established matters of law. Please see the response dated June 24, 2005, for further explanation.



Robert N. Rountree  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 39,347

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner/SPE Signature